



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,523	07/11/2003	Kok-Meng Lee	62004-1621	9107
24504	7590	06/21/2005	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			PARSLEY, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/618,523

Applicant(s)

LEE, KOK-MENG

Examiner

David J. Parsley

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 19-35 and 45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-18 and 36-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 19-35 and 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **Detailed Action**

### ***Amendment***

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment dated 4-20-05 and this action is final.

### ***Drawings***

2. Color photographs and color drawings are acceptable only for examination purposes unless a petition filed under 37 CFR 1.84(a)(2) is granted permitting their use as acceptable drawings. In the event that applicant wishes to use the drawings currently on file as acceptable drawings, a petition must be filed for acceptance of the color photographs or color drawings as acceptable drawings. Any such petition must be accompanied by the appropriate fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h), three sets of color drawings or color photographs, as appropriate, and, unless already present, an amendment to include the following language as the first paragraph of the brief description of the drawings section of the specification:

The patent or application file contains at least one drawing executed in color. Copies of this patent or patent application publication with color drawing(s) will be provided by the Office upon request and payment of the necessary fee.

Color photographs will be accepted if the conditions for accepting color drawings have been satisfied.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15, 22-27, 29-32 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims include limitations regarding x translational direction and x translational speed but it is unclear to exactly where the x direction is in relation to the claimed device.

Claims 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims include limitations regarding x, y and z-axes but it is unclear to exactly where these axes are in relation to the claimed device.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3643

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 5,259,811 to Berry.

Referring to claim 1, Berry discloses a device for grasping and supporting a live object, the device comprising, a pair of counter rotating supporting structures – at 12-14, configured to compel the live object in an x-translational direction at an x-translational speed – see for example figures 1-2, each supporting structure including an upper portion and a lower portion – see for example figures 2-4, and wherein the upper portion includes a plurality of apertures – see in item 27, having a second configuration – see for example figures 3-4, and the lower portion includes a plurality of apertures disposed therein – see in item 27 in figures 3-4, a compliant finger – at 28, disposed within each of the plurality of apertures – see for example figures 2-4, the pair of counter rotating supporting structures are further configured to provide an opening for receiving the live object and wherein the compliant fingers are further configured to support and constrain a body of the live object – see for example figures 5a-5d, and a speed control module for controlling the speed and timing of the rotation of the supporting structures – see for example column 3 lines 29-68, column 4 lines 1-40 and lines 58-68, column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-21.

Referring to claim 3, Berry discloses the lower portion of the supporting structure is further configured to include at least three compliant fingers each disposed in an individual aperture for supporting a body of the live object – see for example the lower half of item 27 in figures 2-4.

Referring to claim 4, Berry discloses the upper portion of the supporting structure is further configured to include at least two compliant fingers for constraining the body of the live object form above – see at the upper portion of item 27 in figures 2-5.

Referring to claim 5, Berry discloses the three compliant fingers each disposed in an aperture in the lower portion of the supporting structure further comprises a first finger of a first length, a second finger of a second length and a third finger of a third length – see for example items – 28 in figures 2-5.

Referring to claim 6, Berry discloses the two compliant fingers each disposed in an aperture in the upper portion of the supporting structure further comprises a fourth finger of a fourth length and a fifth finger of a fifth length – see at items 28 in figures 2-5.

Referring to claim 7, Berry discloses the compliant fingers disposed in the plurality of apertures in the upper section of the supporting structure – at 27, incline downward – see for example figures 2-4, and the compliant fingers disposed in the plurality of apertures in the lower portion of the supporting structure incline upward – see for example at items 12-13 in figures 1-2 where the fingers on the left side of the supporting structure are inclined upward in the direction of the inclined conveyor – at 18,20.

Referring to claim 8, Berry discloses the fingers are of a rubber material – see for example column 4 lines 23-26.

Referring to claim 9, Berry discloses the speed control module is further configured to synchronize the rotation of the supporting structures – at 12-14, with a conveyor – at 18 and/or 24, transporting the live object – see for example figures 1-5, column 3 lines 29-68, column 4 lines 1-40 and lines 58-68, column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-21.

Referring to claim 10, Berry discloses the speed control module is further configured to vary the x-translational speed of the live object while constraining the body in the compliant fingers – see for example figures 1-5, column 3 lines 29-68, column 4 lines 1-40 and lines 58-68, column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-21.

Referring to claim 15, Berry discloses the pair of counter rotating supporting structures – at 12-14, are further configured to rotate at the same speed – see for example column 3 lines 29-68, column 4 lines 1-40 and lines 58-68, column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-21.

Claims 1, 10-11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,514,033 to Berry.

Referring to claim 1, Berry '033 discloses a device for grasping and supporting a live object, the device comprising, a pair of counter rotating supporting structures – at 306,307, configured to compel the live object in an x-translational direction at an x-translational speed – see for example figure 13, each supporting structure including an upper portion and a lower portion – see for example 13 of Berry '811 incorporated by reference, and wherein the upper portion and the lower portion each include a plurality of apertures disposed therein – see in item 319 in figure 13 of Berry '911, the plurality of apertures in the upper portion having a first configuration – see for example figure 13 and the plurality of apertures in the lower portion having a second configuration – see for example figure 13, a compliant finger – see figure 13, disposed within each of the plurality of apertures – see for example figure 13, the pair of counter rotating supporting structures are further configured to provide an opening for receiving the live object and wherein the compliant fingers are further configured to support and constrain a body

Art Unit: 3643

of the live object – see for example figure 13, and a speed control module for controlling the speed and timing of the rotation of the supporting structures – see for example columns 6-7.

Referring to claim 10, Berry '033 discloses the speed control module is further configured to vary the x-translational speed of the live object while constraining the body in the compliant fingers – see for example column 3 lines 29-68, column 4 lines 1-40 and lines 58-68, column 5 lines 1-68 and columns 6-7.

Referring to claim 11, Berry '033, discloses a conveyor – see figure 8, for transporting the live object towards the pair of counter rotating supporting structures – at 30 in figure 8, the conveyor further comprises a pallet assembly 19, 19', having a perch bar – at 23', 24', 25', movably fixed to the conveyor and wherein the perch bar is configured to receive the live object – see for example figures 1-7.

Referring to claim 13, Berry '033 discloses the speed control module controls the timing of the rotation of the supporting structures such that the rotation of the supporting structures is synchronized with the movement of the pallet assemblies – see for example figures 1-8 and column 3 lines 1-40.

Referring to claim 14, Berry '033 discloses the speed control module controls the timing of the rotation of the supporting structures in relation to the speed of the conveyor such that the rotation of the supporting structures moves the live object from the compliant fingers of the pair of counter rotating supporting structures at a specified rate – see for example figures 1-8 and column 3 lines 1-40.

Claims 19-20, 22-27, 29, 33-35 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,658,476 to van den Brink.



Art Unit: 3643

Referring to claim 19, van den Brink discloses a device for receiving an isolated live object the device comprising, a rigid member – at 30-57, having a first end, a second end and a middle section – see for example figures 4-10, the middle section being disposed between the first end and the second end – see figures 4-10, and perch bars – at 44-48, flexibly affixed (items 47 and 48) to the middle section of the rigid member – see for example figures 4-5.

Referring to claim 20, van den Brink discloses the perch bars are cylindrically shaped – at 47,48 and are configured to include longitudinal grooves – at 44,45.

Referring to claims 22 and 33, van den Brink discloses a system comprising, a pallet assembly – at 30-48, having a perch bar supporting structure – at 38, the perch bar supporting structure including perch bars – at 44,45, a shackle assembly – at 59, movably affixed to the pallet assembly – see for example figure 11, the shackle assembly comprising a pair of compliant grippers – at 62,63, a trap bar assembly – at 47,48, the trap bar assembly affixed to the pallet assembly – see for example figures 4-5, a shackle control mechanism – at 3-5,52-57 and 61, affixed to the shackle assembly, the shackle control mechanism configured to lock and release the shackle assembly from the pallet assembly – see for example figures 10-11, and a trolley affixed to the pallet assembly configured to move in an x-translational direction – see for example at the upper end of 54 in figures 10-11.

Referring to claim 23, van den Brink discloses the pallet assembly is configured to include rollers – at 32,33, for traversing on a conveyor – at 31-33, the pallet assembly further being configured to travel along a separate track of the conveyor from a track of the conveyor utilized by the trolley – see for example figure 2.

Referring to claim 24, van den Brink discloses the conveyor further comprises a drop cam, configured to define a transition in a z-direction, wherein the z-direction comprises a normal vector relative to a conveyor surface – see for example figures 1-2 and 9-10 and column 4 lines 8-14.

Referring to claim 25, van den Brink discloses the trolley is configured to move along the drop cam in a z-translational direction while continuing to travel in an x-translational direction – see for example figures 10-11.

Referring to claim 26, van den Brink discloses the shackle control mechanism further comprises a shackle stopper – at 4,52,57, and a shackle releaser – at 5, wherein the shackle stopper and the shackle releaser provide for a move or stop control in both an x and z direction – see for example figures 1-11.

Referring to claim 27, van den Brink discloses the shackle assembly further comprises a shackle and an x-translational guide – see at the upper end of 59 in figure 11, the x-translational guide configured to provide for forward and backward movement of the shackle in the x-translational direction relative to the pallet assembly, the movement of the shackle in the z-direction to stay above the pallet assembly when the trolley of the pallet assembly moves along the drop cam – see for example figures 1-11.

Referring to claim 29, van den Brink discloses a back panel affixed to a rear portion of the pallet assembly – see at 34,36 in figure 10.

Referring to claim 34, van den Brink discloses an inverter portion – see for example figures 10-11, that follows an inversion path for inverting the isolated live object shackled in the shackle assembly – see for example figures 10-11.

Referring to claim 35, van den Brink discloses the first speed control module and the second speed control module add claim to a speed profile – see for example columns 4-7.

Referring to claim 45, van den Brink discloses a feet gripping system comprising, a perch bar – at 44,45, having a z-direction compliance, the z-direction being a direction along a superior-inferior axis of a live object – see for example figures 4-5, the perch bar being configured to support a live object – see for example figures 4-5, grippers – at 47,48, having a y-direction compliance, the y-direction being a direction along a lateral axis of the live object, the grippers being configured to support the live object – see for example figures 4-5, and a first assembly comprising a spring – see column 4 lines 50-67, the first assembly having an x-direction compliance, the x-direction being a direction along an anterior-posterior axis of the live object – see for example figures 1-11.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry as applied to claim 1 above. Berry does not disclose each compliant finger has a structural rigidity between  $0.08\text{Nm}^2$  and approximately  $0.35\text{Nm}^2$ . However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Berry and add the structural rigidity of the fingers as being

Art Unit: 3643

between  $0.08\text{Nm}^2$  and approximately  $0.35\text{Nm}^2$ , so as to allow for the fingers to not damage the live objects during use. Further, applicant offers no specific details in the specification stating that the range of values for the structural rigidity of the fingers, solves any particular problems or is done for any particular reason over differing structural rigidity values.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry '033 as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of van den Brink.

Referring to claim 12, Berry '033 discloses a shackle – at 19', affixed to the perch bar, the shackle having a pair of grippers – at 26', 27', for gripping extending legs of the live object. Berry '033 does not disclose when the perch bar declines under the shackle, the set of compliant fingers of the pair of counter rotating supporting structures constrains the live object therein. Van den Brink does disclose when the perch bar – at 60, 61, declines under the shackle – at 59, the set of compliant fingers – at 55, of the pair of counter rotating supporting structures – at the end portions of items 55 connected to the pins in item 61, constrains the live object therein – see for example figure 11. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Berry '033 and add the perch bar and shackle of van den Brink, so as to allow for the live object to be securely held during transfers to other conveyors for further processing.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van den Brink as applied to claim 19 above. Van den Brink does not disclose the perch bar is covered with rubber. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of van den Brink and add the perch bar covered with rubber, so as to protect the live object in that it contacts the softer rubber material.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van den Brink as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,561,555 to Millard. van den Brink further discloses the trap bar assembly – at 47,48, is configured to rotate along an axis that is fixed with respect to the pallet – see for example figures 1-11. Van den Brink does not disclose the trap bar assembly comprises a magnetic lock a roller and a cam. Millard does disclose the trap bar assembly – at 16, has a magnetic lock – at 18, a roller – at 32 and a cam – see for example column 1 lines 48-64. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of van den Brink and add the magnetic lock of Millard, so as to securely hold the trap bar assembly in place.

Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van den Brink as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Berry '811.

Referring to claims 31-32, Van den Brink does not disclose a pair of counter rotating supporting structures each supporting structure including an upper portion and a lower portion and wherein the upper portion and the lower portion each include a plurality of apertures disposed therein a compliant finger disposed within each of the plurality of apertures the pair of counter rotating supporting structures are further configured to provide an opening for receiving the live object and wherein the compliant fingers are further configured to support and constrain a body of the live object. Berry '811 does disclose a pair of counter rotating supporting structures – at 12-14, each supporting structure including an upper portion and a lower portion – see for example figures 2-4, and wherein the upper portion and the lower portion each include a plurality of apertures disposed therein – see in item 27 in figures 3-4, a compliant finger – at 28, disposed within each of the plurality of apertures – see for example figures 2-4, the pair of counter rotating

Art Unit: 3643

supporting structures are further configured to provide an opening for receiving the live object and wherein the compliant fingers are further configured to support and constrain a body of the live object – see for example figures 5a-5d, and a speed control module for controlling the speed and timing of the rotation of the supporting structures – see for example column 3 lines 29-68, column 4 lines 1-40 and lines 58-68, column 5 lines 1-68 and column 6 lines 1-21. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of van den Brink and add the rotating support structures of Berry '811, so as to allow for the orientation of the live object to be proper for further processing/conveying.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

6. Claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

#### *Response to Arguments*

7. Regarding claims 1, 3-10 and 15, applicant argues that the Berry reference US 5259811 does not disclose a supporting structure having an upper and a lower portion. However, as seen in figures 3-4 of the Berry reference the support structure – at 27, is a vertical column type device which has an upper portion in the upper half of the structure – at 27 and a lower portion at the lower half of the structure – at 27 as seen in figures 3-4. Applicant further argues that the Berry reference does not disclose structures configured to support and constrain the body of a live object. However, as seen in figures 5a-5d and in column 4 lines 61-68, where the live

Art Unit: 3643

animals moved onto the conveyor – at 18, via the devices – at 13-14. Applicant further argues that the Berry reference does not disclose a speed control module for controlling the speed and timing of the rotation of the supporting structures. However, as seen in column 3 lines 29-68 a control mechanism/module is disclosed for controlling movement of the rotors – at 13-14, and thus control the speed of the rotors – at 13, 14.

Regarding claims 1, 10-11 and 13-14 to the Berry reference US 5514033 applicant relies upon the same arguments with respect to the Berry reference US 5259811 since the '811 reference is incorporated by reference into the '033 device. Therefore, see the response to these arguments above in this paragraph of the office action. Further, applicant argues that the Berry '033 reference does not disclose a speed control module. However, as seen in columns 6-7 of the Berry '811 device which is incorporated by reference. In columns 6-7 of the Berry '811 reference the controlling of the rotation of the rotors – at 300,302, via the control module – at 322 is described. Applicant further argues that the Berry '033 reference does not disclose supporting and constraining a body of a live object. However, the devices – at 306,307 operate as the devices – at 13-14 and therefore support and constrain the live objects as seen above with reference to the Berry '811 reference above.

Regarding claims 19-20, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference US 4658476 does not disclose perch bars flexibly affixed to the middle section of the rigid member. As seen in figures 5a-5c of the van den Brink reference the perch bars – at 44-48, are affixed to rigid members at either of 30, 36 or 34 and move with respect to these elements – at 30,34,36 as seen in figures 5a-5c and therefore since they are movable with respect to these elements they are flexibly affixed to these elements. Further, as seen in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary

Art Unit: 3643

10<sup>th</sup> edition the term perch is defined as a bar or peg on which something is hung and as seen in figure 5c the live object is hung via the bar components – at 44-48.

Regarding claims 22-27, 29 and 33-35, the van den Brink reference discloses a pallet – at 38 having perch bars – at 44-48, which when combined together form the entire pallet assembly. Further, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference does not disclose a shackle assembly movably affixed to the pallet assembly. However, as seen in figures 1-2 of the van den Brink reference, the shackle assemblies – at 59, are affixed to the pallet assemblies – at 38-44, in that they are connected/affixed to one another via intervening components such as the floor of the processing plant or via the conveyor system – at 4. Further, applicant argues that van den Brink reference does not disclose the shackle assembly comprises a pair of compliant grippers. However, as seen in figure 11 of the van den Brink reference, the shackle assembly has gripping portions – at 62, which comply to the legs of the animal and thus are compliant. Further, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference does not disclose a shackle control mechanism affixed to the shackle assembly configured to lock and release the shackle assembly from the pallet assembly. However, as seen in figures 1-11 of the van den Brink reference, the shackle control mechanism – at 52-57, moves the live objects from the pallets – at 38 to the shackles – at 59, with the pallet conveyors – at 3 connected to the shackle conveyor – at 5, via the conveyor – at 4 as seen in figures 1-2. Therefore, the control mechanism – at 52-57, holds the shackle – at 59, to the conveyors – at 3 and 4, to load the live object to the shackle and then releases the shackle – at 59, from the conveyors – at 3 and 4, when the live object has been loaded onto the shackle – at 59 as seen in figures 8-11.



Regarding claim 45, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference does not disclose perch bars having a z-direction compliance. However, it is unclear to what direction the z-direction is as seen in paragraph 3 above. Further, the perch bars – at 44-48, of the van den Brink reference comply in holding the live object with respect to different conveying directions and thus exhibit directional compliance. Further, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference does not disclose gripper configured to support a live object. However, as seen in figures 9-11 of the van den Brink reference the grippers – at 47-48, are used to hold the live object to the pallet – at 38 and thus the gripper elements – at 47-48, assist in supporting the live object. Further, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference does not disclose the grippers having y-direction compliance. However, as seen in paragraph 3 of this office action it is unclear to what direction the y-direction is. Further, as seen in figures 9-11, the grippers – at 47-48, are configured to remain in a certain position with respect to the pallet – at 38 and live object and thus when the pallet moves the grippers move and thus are compliant to moving in a certain direction. Further, applicant argues that the van den Brink reference does not disclose a spring. However, as seen in column 4 lines 50-68, of the van den Brink reference discloses the use of springs on the device. The springs are disclosed as being used on the conveyor – at 1 and if the entire device comprising conveyors – at 1-5, is construed as the gripping system than the springs described in column 4 of the van den Brink reference read on the claimed invention of claim 45.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections to claims 2, 12, 21 and 30-32, applicant relies upon the arguments to the claims from which these claims depend. Therefore, see the response to these arguments above with respect to claims 1, 11, 19 and 22.

*Conclusion*

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Parsley whose telephone number is (571) 272-6890. The examiner can normally be reached on 9hr compressed.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on (571) 272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Parsley  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3643



**PETER M. POON**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

6/17/05